



2008219.01

**BEREA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

Tuesday, April 7, 2009

In Attendance

J. GrosseBusiness Manager
R. King.....GPD Associates
Planning Committee Per Sign-In Sheet

Distribution

All in Attendance
M. Salopek.....GPD Associates

The following is a brief list if items discussed:

- J. Grosse opened the meeting with an explanation of the process undertaken thus far. This included the participation of the first committee as to the educational delivery model favored for this proposed building. He also explained that the District's participation in the Ohio Schools Facilities Commission (OSFC) program and how the co-funding worked. It is noted that participation in the program means that the standards of the OSFC need to be followed. It was also to be noted that the costs of anything over and above the OSFC standards would be required to be 100% funded by the District. Initial discussions with the Administration had indicated that some changes would be required, such as increasing the size of the Media Center and Gymnasium.
- R. King showed a PowerPoint presentation which presented a brief overview of the process to be followed during the design of the project. He also explained what spaces were originally envisioned and how discussions with the first committee had caused the spaces and sizes to be revised.
- R. King which showed some features of the 2 Lakewood Elementary schools which had been built to OSFC standards.
- R. King also showed an arrangement of a building and parking and a bus loop on the current Fairwood Elementary site. The layout shows 210 spaces in the front of the building and a bus loop around the building. This bus loop would also provide a service drive to the Kitchen/Loading Dock. Questions related to this layout included:
 - Could the parking be located behind the building so as to show the façade instead of a sea of parking? *Response: That can be investigated but there are other negative factors such as crossing a greater traffic flow to get to the playground.*



- Although the diagram shows 210 spaces (as per the City Zoning Code) could a variance be obtained for reducing the number? *Response: This can be investigated with the City.*
- The bus loop seems to take up a lot of real estate on the site. Could it be re-arranged so as to not cut the site up and also prevent crossing to access the playground? Also, what about the bus loop being utilized as part of the walking track which had been suggested previously? *Response: This can be investigated.*
- There is no soccer field – why? *Response: This was reviewed in the first group meetings and it was considered that if the field would be out of commission for the two years of construction, alternate facilities would have to be utilized and these could possibly become permanent. Additionally, it may be possible to provide the soccer field on the current Board of Education site.*
- What about access for walking students? *Response: This would need better attention in the detail planning.*
- There seems to be a lot of paving in front of the building. What happens with release of students in bad weather conditions? *Response: From the example at Big Creek Elementary, Linda Simon stated that first the pre-schoolers are released, then the walking students, then the car pick-up students, then buses (first 7 then a second 7). Releases have 5-minute intervals and are in two separate areas (buses/cars). It is noted that the cars are 8 at a time and if the students are not there, then the cars have to circulate to the back of the line. Apparently this system does not mean the students being out in bad weather for any significant length of time. R. King advised that the possible layout could have the bus students released from the gym/cafeteria area which would mean a convenient gathering point under shelter.*
- Please ensure that there is a handicap accessible route to the playground. *Response: Most definitely.*
- Is the playground a co-funded element? *Response: Yes, it would be part of the Ohio Schools Facilities Commission (OSFC) standards.*
- Following presentation of some zoning and adjacency layouts by R. King, discussion followed on possible layout of the building itself:
 - Are there any advantages of being single-story or double-story? *Response: A 2-story building would have a smaller footprint on the site. It has less exterior envelope area (walls and roof) which would improve the building's energy efficiency. On the other hand, it would need an elevator which is an ongoing operational expense and this type of building did not lend itself well to providing natural light (through skylights) to deep interior spaces. Also, a single story building has more of a cohesive "one-community" feel.*
 - "Pod" layout – R. King explained the pod concept of grouping grade level classrooms around a common "extended learning area" for teaming, enhancing small-group work for project-based learning etc. This was a departure from typical double-loaded corridor/classrooms that most schools are designed around. It was generally felt that the pod arrangement offered more flexibility which was a good



thing. The downside is that the square footage for this area has to be obtained from somewhere – the OSFC has recognized the possibility of such group areas and conceded that 10% of the classroom square footage could be utilized to create these spaces. During the Lakewood tour, some had felt that even the typical 900 sq.ft seemed small but this varied depending upon how the teachers had laid out the rooms.

- Some items that had been identified for review included the teacher's desk in the classroom (and how it should or should not be tied to the technology cabinet in the room) and whether the lockers/cubbies should be in the classroom or not. There was a definite request for doors on the cubbies. It was suggested that the previous survey be re-issued with a few pro's and con's for lockers in and out of the classroom.
 - One of the diagrams that showed the close relationship of the art/music/stage/cafeteria/gym spaces was preferred to the other layout. It is noted in the preferred layout acoustics in the gym are always an issue but perhaps use of the gym as an overflow space for events could be limited to assemblies. Stage productions could perhaps schedule two performances for use of the Cafeteria alone.
 - The typical gym floor material was questioned. R. King's response was that the standard per the OSFC is VCT (vinyl tile) with vinyl sheet and rubber as possible upgrades. A proper wood gym floor was not a standard for an elementary school and 100% of the cost of this would have to be borne by the District (Lakewood had done this in their gyms as they are well-used community facilities).
 - R. King sketched out a possible alternate restroom layout which could be used in one of the common areas in the pods. Large group restrooms would still be required adjacent to places like the gym/cafeteria.
- The next meeting will be Tuesday, April 14, 2009, at 4:00 p.m.

The preceding is GPD Associates interpretation of the meeting. Any changes, additions, or clarifications should be forwarded to our office as soon as possible. Unless these changes are furnished within ten (10) working days, it will be understood that all parties are in agreement with the preceding statements.

Respectfully submitted,
GPD Associates
Architects&Engineers&Planners
520 South Main Street, Suite 2531
Akron, Ohio 44311-1010
(330) 572-2100 - Phone (330) 572-2102 – Fax